

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Claims 4 and 6, and amended claims 1 and 5 are in the present application.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,143).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"receiving means for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel with an interference signal having a carrier frequency of a highest peak level, said interference signal mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said same channel;

phase locking means for attaining phase locking to said interference signal of said highest peak level;

level adjusting means for adjusting a level of a phase-locked signal that is output from the phase locking means to be equal to a level of said interference signal; and

subtracting means for subtracting the level-adjusted, phase-locked signal from the reception signal of said reception means."  
(Emphasis added.)

As best understood, in explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to rely on limiter 180 of Igarashi and states that such limiter "dynamically adjusts interference of a peak level . . . ." (See, for example, lines 10-14 of section 1 on page 2 and lines 12-14 of section 3 on page 3 of the present Office Action.)

As indicated above, claim 1 now recites "receiving means for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a

frequency bandwidth of a channel with an interference signal having a carrier frequency of a highest peak level, said interference signal mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said same channel." (Emphasis added.) It is respectfully submitted that the limiter 180 of Igarashi does not suppress or adjust an interference signal in the same channel as the reception signal. Instead, it appears that the limiter 180 of Igarashi suppresses or adjusts an interference signal located in a channel adjacent to the desired signal. (See, for example, lines 1-30 of column 7 of Igarashi.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 is also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.


Claims 4 and 6 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that that dependent claims 4 and 6 are also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described with regard to claims 1 and 5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

786250\_1.DOC